DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 126 SO 012 849

AUTHOR Raab, Earl; Lipset, Seymour M.
TITLE Prejudice and Society.
INSTITUTION B'nai B'rith, New York, N.Y. Anti-Defamation League.
PUB DATE 68
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Behavior; *Bias; Socialization; Social Problems; Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

This monograph consists of six chapters which discuss the problem of prejudice in our society. Chapter I looks at "Prejudice as a Social Problem." As a social problem prejudice can be defined exclusively in terms of human behavior which denies or attempts to deny equality of opportunity or status to certain racial, religious, or ethnic groups. Prejudiced behavior treats individuals as though they were not individuals at all but, rather, indistinguishable parts of a classified group. "The Shifting Nature of Prejudice" is discussed in Chapter II. Prejudiced attitudes do not predetermine prejudiced behavior. An individual's prejudiced behavior may be determined more by the social situation at any given moment than by his pre-existing attitudes. Chapter III "Learning Prejudice" points out that the learning of prejudice is effected primarily by the kinds of social situations in which people live. Chapter IV "The Prejudiced Community" discusses how the pattern of community practices is the fountainhead of prejudice. The growing child learns his social behavior primarily by following the modes and models of behavior around him. "Family and Group Influences in the Prejudiced Community" is the topic of Chapter V. The complex of prejudicial practices within a community provides the family and other traditional groups with the "frame of reference" which perpetuates these practices and sustains prejudice. "Some Implications for Action" is the topic of the concluding chapter. The custom of prejudice may be changed through remedial social action. Various channels of social action such as the law, direct action, mass media, the schools, and community groups may help to effect this change. In addition, the individual must examine and attempt to understand his own behavior and attitudes. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193126

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Stanley Wexler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREJUDICE AND SOCIETY

by EARL RAAB AND SEYMOUR M. LIPSET

SP 010 848

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright—1959, 1963, 1967, 1968
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Freedom Pamphlets are published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016

Other Freedom Pamphlets

DANGER IN DISCORD. Oscar and Mary Handlin. (50¢)

ABC'S OF SCAPEGOATING. Gordon W. Allport. (50¢)

GROUP DYNAMICS AND SOCIAL ACTION. Benne, Bradford and Lippitt. (35¢)

THE RESPONSIBILITY IS OURS. Bonaro Overstreet. (35¢)

PREJUDICE AND POLITICS. Charles P. Taft and Bruce L. Felknor. (50¢)

INTRODUCTION

The problem of achieving equal rights and harmonious intergroup relations in our nation is often referred to as "the problem of prejudice." This formulation can be highly misleading. Intergroup relations problems can and do exist without any dimension that can sensibly be defined as "prejudice." An immigrant group with significant cultural and educational differences can obviously pose an intergroup relations problem, whether it is a group of Latvians who have moved to Atlanta, or a group of southern Negroes who have moved to Boston. The general assumption is that many of these problems will diminish as the differences themselves diminish or are equitably adjusted. It is only where the normal adjustment of these differences is persistently obstructed or resisted by the dominant group that the element of prejudice enters. To the extent that such normal adjustment has been obstructed, it is certainly true that some of our most abiding intergroup relations problems are currently or historically "problems in prejudice."

But the formulation is equally as misleading if "prejudice" is taken to mean "prejudiced attitudes." Prejudiced attitudes do not form the substance of our national "problem of prejudice." The daily substance of our problem is prejudiced *behavior*, which can be defined, without causal reference, as that behavior which irrelevantly denies or attempts to deny equality of opportunity or status. Further, prejudiced attitudes are not even the prime movers of such behavior; they do not necessarily, or even typically, cause such behavior. Prejudiced attitudes, in fact, may not even accompany prejudiced behavior, and when they do, they may often be a by-product of that behavior. In short, the relationship between prejudiced attitudes and prejudiced behavior — and, therefore, between prejudiced attitudes and the problem of intergroup relations — is a dubious and widely misread one.

These conclusions are now supported by an impressive body of research evidence, and they are corroborated furthermore by events that are taking place in our nation today. Melvin Tumin, in an article, "Sociological Aspects of Desegregation" in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, wrote:

"The single most important lesson we have learned

from the reactions throughout the nation to the Supreme Court order concerning the desegregation of public schools is that it is possible to make significant changes in the behavior of men without first producing commensurate changes in their feelings. Schools have been desegregated, Negro and white children have gone to school together for the first time in their lives, white and Negro teachers have shared faculty status in the same schools for the first time in their lives; yet, it is highly unlikely that the feelings which these people had for each other before the Supreme Court order have been changed nearly as much as their behavior toward each other. In short, a good deal of discrimination has been eliminated without a matching reduction in the amount of prejudice."

By methodically destroying the image of an umbilical-cord relationship between prejudiced attitudes and prejudiced behavior, this pamphlet poses a "third force," the *Prejudiced Community*, as the critical recreator of widespread prejudiced behavior. The Prejudiced Community, composed of certain identifiable sets of common practices, becomes then a workable framework within which programs for dealing with and modifying intergroup relations problems can be meaningfully measured and devised. Because of the clear need that has existed for a more sharply defined and practical analysis of the widespread pattern of prejudice, it is hoped that this pamphlet will be useful to students and practitioners in the field of intergroup relations.

EARL RAAB
Executive Director
San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council

SEYMOUR M. LIPSET
Professor of Government and Social Relations
Harvard University

CHAPTER I

PREJUDICE AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

The term "prejudice" allows for many definitions; but as a social problem *in America today, prejudice can be defined exclusively in terms of human* behavior *which denies or attempts to deny equality of opportunity or status to certain racial, religious or ethnic groups.*

The "problem of prejudice" emerges from the columns of the daily newspapers as one of our nation's most disturbing domestic problems. A sampling of news stories reported in the daily press in recent years might include the following:

- Little Rock, New Orleans, Birmingham become internationally notorious scenes of violence as unruly mobs protest law integration; and as thousands of Negro men, women and children are jailed.

- In Clinton, Tennessee, an integrated high school is partially destroyed by dynamite. A synagogue is bombed in Atlanta, Georgia. A synagogue in Miami, Florida, and another in Nashville, Tennessee are dynamited on the same day.

- A report issued by the Anti-Defamation League reveals that some employment agencies in New York State have worked out particularly elaborate codes to screen out job applicants, in violation of the state FEPC law.

- As the first Negro family moves into Levittown, Pa., a suburban all-white community, violence erupts and state police are called in to disperse and arrest rock-throwing, cross-burning rioters.

- A survey of resort discrimination in the United States reveals that out of 933 resorts investigated, 214 or 22.9 per cent discriminate against Jews.

- Two visitors to the United States, one from Ethiopia and the other from Ghana, are denied seats in a restaurant in Alexandria, Va. because they are Negroes. Both are members of a group studying at the United Nations and are touring the area.

• A report discloses that more than half of about 5000 cooperative apartments in Chicago are believed to be discriminatory or, under an explicitly stated policy, maintain a strict quota limitation of Jews.

• Despite a boycott by 11 institutions, about 1000 delegates of a national educational society attend a conference at the Lake Placid Club which is known to practice discrimination against Jews through a restrictive membership and guest policy.

• A study of housing discrimination discloses that the Incorporated Village of Bronxville in Westchester County in the New York metropolitan area has earned a reputation for admitting to its precincts as home-owners or -renters only those who profess to be Christians.

• According to a 1958 report by the Commission on Race and Housing, no fewer than 27,000,000 Americans — nearly one-sixth of our people — are restricted in their choice of a place to live by their race, religion or ethnic origin.

• Studies by the Bureau on Jewish Employment Problems of 30,000 white-collar job openings in Chicago indicated that 98 per cent of these job openings bar consideration of non-whites. One-fifth exclude Jews, Catholics and members of various nationality groups. The bureau investigated the practices of 100 companies.

These items describe the face of prejudice as our society sees it and is concerned with it. All of the items describe some aspect of social *behavior*. They refer directly to ways in which men *act* towards other men. And these aspects of social behavior have one basic element in common: *the denial or attempted denial of equal status and opportunity to large groups of people because of their racial, religious or ethnic identity.*

Prejudiced Behavior Creates the Social Problem

It is precisely such acts of denial which constitute the social problem of prejudice. It is this behavior — legitimately termed "prejudiced behavior" no matter what its cause or motivation — which, in itself, forces organized society to consider prejudice as a serious problem. Prejudiced behavior treats individuals as though they were not individuals at all but, rather, indistinguishable parts of a classified group. Prejudiced behavior is not only irrele-

vant to the characteristics of the individual, but irrelevant to the characteristics of the group. If an employer refuses to hire a Negro *because* he is a Negro, this is prejudiced behavior in itself, no matter what mental processes may be involved; it contributes equally to the social problems delineated heretofore, no matter what mental processes may be involved.

Why is such behavior considered a social problem?

1) *The threat to social order:* A society tends to break down when the "going rules" for relationships among its members become unacceptable to a large number of those members. One of the functions of an organized society is to let its members know what kind of behavior they may normally expect from each other. In our society, one man is not normally expected to assault another man or to cheat him, at least not outrageously. Parents are normally expected to take care of their children. The children of manual workers expect to get into college on the same basis as children of white-collar workers. Some of these "rules of relationship" are formal and regulated by law; others are "unwritten" customs. In either case, they cannot be maintained in American society by police power; these rules of behavior must be accepted by the bulk of society. But whether these rules of relationship are accepted depends, partly, on whether they can satisfy the major goals or aspirations variously held by the bulk of society.

Thus, the question is not what these aspirations *should* be, but what they *are* in fact. In analogy: if a child has not learned to *expect* many gifts from his parents, he is not as disturbed by the absence of such gifts as is a child who has learned to expect them. Social expectations are learned; they differ in different times and in different places. Where a group has not learned to expect equal status or opportunity, the absence of such status or opportunity does not create an active intergroup relations problem for society.

This does not mean that group prejudice can ever be counted more or less moral. It is legitimate hindsight, for example, which labels "immoral" the bartering of human slaves in the market place, even though it may not have been considered immoral in early America. The same hindsight would apply to the ghettoizing of Jews in medieval Europe. If each man is born with a divine right or a natural right to human dignity which other men cannot legitimately violate, then he has always been so born. Basic moral con-

cepts are not "adjustable" as to time and place; although our judgments about people who have committed immoral acts may be tempered by historical perspective.

In other words, the *moral* problem involved in the unequal treatment of racial and religious groups was always present; but where the expectations and aspirations of these groups did not seriously conflict with this unequal treatment, there was no serious *social* problem, i.e., there was no threat to the going rules of relationship. Robert E. Park has commented: "Where distinctions based on class, caste and race are part of the established social order . . . each caste and class lives within the limitations of its own world and accepts the definition imposed upon it as if it were part of the order of nature."

In short, the modern social problem of prejudice has sharpened in proportion to the growth of aspirations in traditionally subordinated groups.

For example, in Greenwood, Mississippi, there was no "problem" about Negroes voting in the 1960 election. No more than a dozen even tried to register to vote. In 1963, *three thousand* Negroes in Greenwood attempted to register to vote, and there was violence, shooting and bloodshed. One Negro man, engaged in "bringing out the vote" in that city, said: "Ten years ago, I would never have dreamed of registering myself, much less running around trying to get others to register."

Fifty years ago, there was no notable expression of concern about the lack of equal housing opportunity for American Negroes. The industrial needs of the World Wars brought a substantial number of Negroes into the mainstream of the American economy — and also brought them to the metropolitan centers of the North where they gained political significance. They took their place alongside other Americans in the assembly lines and, eventually, in the armed forces. Their economic and educational status improved. They became more sensitive to the fact that the official values of this democracy were supposed to embrace them as well. This sensitivity was spurred by a growing leadership within the American Negro community and a civil rights movement in general. To reverse the hoary racist formula, the American Negro — a substantial segment of the American population — now "knows his place" in American life and is more intent than ever before to achieve this place.

These new aspirations of the Negro, which are in keeping with the official values of our society, conflict with many of the traditional "rules of relationship" for Negroes and whites in this country. Changes in these rules so that they may accommodate the new goals of the Negro community are seriously blocked by the kind of behavior described previously in the newspaper items.

The more a society is unable to accommodate mutual expectations and relationships among substantial numbers of its members, then the more it has an active social problem which threatens its functioning as an effective social order.

Therefore, it is a practical necessity for society to develop a new and harmonious order of relationships which will accommodate these new and legitimate aspirations. It is *this* growing necessity which is at the heart of the current ferment about the race relations problem.

2) *The waste of human resources:* Modern industrial society increasingly depends on the development of new talents and energies within its population for its very life; it cannot afford to cut itself off from major sources of such talent or energy. The intricate economic and political machinery that has evolved to meet modern needs demands the fullest use of available industrial, scientific and leadership skills. There is a constant shortage of top-level scientists, technicians, executives and public administrators. The opportunity for every man to develop his capacities is no longer just an abstract ethical precept that attaches to democracy. It is a practical condition of a modern industrial society. Such a society can function efficiently only if opportunity for full development and participation is not arbitrarily removed from large groups of its population.

3) *The threat to democratic life:* The ideological structure of our democratic order is based upon the principle of the equal worth and dignity of all human beings. If this principle is significantly breached, it is no longer an operative principle; and democratic life has lost the main underpinning of its rationale. Theoretically, the denial of equal status and opportunity to any single individual on arbitrary grounds should prick the moral conscience of a democratic society, but it is not necessarily a serious threat to the ethical foundations of that society. However, where there is a *mass* and institutionalized denial of opportunity, and

where there is an open and substantial flouting of the principle of human dignity, such a threat does exist.

Under such circumstances, it is more difficult to teach children that the inviolable dignity of man is a sacred principle; it is more difficult to convince the world that America is dedicated to such a principle. The sharpening conflict between traditional relationships and new aspirations has made this value-conflict more blatant and dramatic, and therefore more threatening to the security of our democratic value system.

These are the practical threats that make prejudice a problem for society. These are threats that are posed by social *behavior* that denies equality of status or opportunity to racial, religious or ethnic groups: acts which frustrate the legitimate aspirations of members of those groups; acts which prevent members of those groups from developing or using their full talents; acts which openly flout the principle that each man is born with certain inalienable rights.

In sum, it is prejudiced behavior which in itself constitutes the social problem of prejudice. The state of mind or attitude which may accompany prejudiced behavior is not in itself the problem, unless it is discovered to have some significant causative relationship to that behavior.

11

CHAPTER II

THE SHIFTING NATURE OF PREJUDICE

Prejudiced attitudes do not predetermine prejudiced behavior. An individual's prejudiced behavior may be determined more by the social situation at any given moment than by his pre-existing attitudes. Both attitude and behavior are highly susceptible to situational changes.

The problem of prejudice as it presents itself to society consists of overt acts which deny equal status or opportunity to people because of their racial, religious or ethnic identity. However, "prejudice" is often used in a specialized sense to describe an individual's state of mind or attitude. There has long been a popular tendency to reify "prejudiced attitude"; to conceive of it as a little mental package tucked away in a corner of the brain, waiting for the proper stimulus to bring it to life. According to this view, if a person has "a prejudiced attitude" against Filipinos, then when a Filipino brushes up against him, or enters the same room he's in, or applies to him for a job, or tries to move next door, this attitude would be triggered and the "prejudiced person" would act accordingly.

The evidence clearly indicates, however, that prejudiced attitudes are very far from being neat little mental packages; and that, at the very least, they do not predetermine prejudiced behavior.

Gordon Allport has partly defined an attitude as a "mental and neural state of readiness." The meaningful reference here is to the fact that an attitude is a "mental and neural" state and not just to the fact that it is a state of readiness. A mechanical jack-in-the-box, crouched on its springs, might be said to have an attitude of readiness. Its attitude is such that it will jump up when the cover is removed. But a human attitude describes an internal state that has an independent existence, apart from any resultant behavior. If a child were simulating a jack-in-the-box in a school play, his attitude towards jumping out of the box in which he was crouched might consist of a combination of elements, e.g., he may be displeased about the physical prospect of

jumping out; on the other hand, he may have a strong fear of the derision he will face if he fails to jump. Both of these elements comprise his "attitude about jumping" at a given point. The attitude exists as a real fact even if the show is cancelled and he never does have the opportunity of jumping or not jumping.

The Elements of Attitude

There is the possibility of at least two basic *kinds* of elements in any attitude: a cognitive element and an emotional element. The first has to do with the way we perceive or *think* of an object; the second has to do with the way we *feel* about an object. Both components usually are included in the typical definition of a "prejudiced attitude." A person may *feel* hostility or distaste towards Mexicans, for example. In addition, he may *think* of all Mexicans as lazy or uneducated or whatever. This cognitive element, this derogatory "picture" that we may have in our minds of a minority group, is most simply classified as an "over-generalization."

The difference between generalization and over-generalization is the critical difference between prejudgment and prejudice. We constantly find it necessary to prejudge objects, to generalize about them. We prejudge a lemon as sour without tasting it. We prejudge a tank of gasoline as combustible, without setting a match to it. But when we prejudge a redhead as hot-tempered, we are over-generalizing, or to put it more accurately, mis-generalizing. When we prejudge a Negro as lazy, an Oriental as sly, an Italian as noisy or a Jew as clever, we are similarly mis-generalizing. Neither intelligence nor qualities of character nor other aspects of personality are innate properties of any hair-colored, skin-colored, religious, racial or national groups. These identities of color or of religious, racial or national background are irrelevant to and therefore mistakenly used as a measure of qualities of intelligence or character. The fact that a lemon is yellow is irrelevant to its sourness, and would therefore be mistakenly used as a measure of the quality of sourness in other foods, such as the yolks of eggs. The religion or skin color of any human group is irrelevant to its distribution of innate aptitudes; more important, perhaps, the religion or skin color of any human being is irrelevant to his actual abilities as an individual. The over-generalized image that we have of the members of any human group is called a stereotype.

Hostility and Stereotype

It is common to think of the prejudiced attitude as consisting of both hostility and an over-generalization or stereotype. It is even common to think of the hostility as flowing from the stereotype. But, in fact, it is possible for an individual to have the stereotype without the hostility, or the hostility without the stereotype. It is possible to cloak two groups with the same stereotype, and have different feelings about them. Saenger and Flowerman questioned some 450 college students as to their feeling of dislike for a number of human groups.[1] They also asked these students to indicate the characteristics which they believed marked these groups. Presumably their likes or dislikes would be based on the kinds of characteristics which they attributed to these groups. This was not the case. Students who expressed a dislike for Jews ascribed to them characteristics which they also ascribed to other groups for whom they did *not* express a dislike. For example, 31 per cent of the students complained that the Jews were mercenary; but 24 per cent of them complained that Americans were mercenary and 38 per cent that businessmen were mercenary. However, Jews were more often disliked for this quality than were Americans or businessmen.

In a study made by B. M. Kramer, he marked off five "distance zones" from an area in which Negroes were moving[2] and interviewed white residents in each of the zones. Zone 1 was the closest to this area of expanding Negro movement. Zone 5 was the most remote, three miles away. There was a general desire among white residents in all five zones to exclude Negroes from their neighborhoods. Kramer checked the stereotypes held by these white residents about Negroes, e.g., that Negroes were personally unclean or diseased. In Zone 1, where the white residents had the closest contact with the Negroes, only five per cent offered such stereotypes as reasons for exclusion; as against 25 per cent of the residents in Zone 5. However, the intensity of hostility in Zone 1 was higher than in Zone 5; in Zone 1, 64 per cent of the residents made spontaneous expressions of hostility, as against only four per cent in Zone 5. Whatever else may have been involved in the situation, it was clear that hostility and stereotype were not tied to each other.

A negative stereotype may exist without hostility; hostility without a negative stereotype; a combination of both

cognitive and emotional elements may exist with varying degrees of intensity and with varying targets. A prejudiced attitude is indeed not a homogeneous mental package. Prejudiced attitude #1 is different from prejudiced attitude #2, and there is almost an endless variety of possibilities.

Frame of Reference — The Situational Factor

Not only do prejudiced attitudes differ widely from one individual to another, but they tend to differ from one situation to another for any given individual. For an attitude is not a thing, it is a process; it is an interaction. It is an interaction involving not only the person and the object, but all other factors that are present in any situation. A crude illustration: In his own home town, Jones may have the deepest contempt for Smith, who lives up the block. He considers Smith a rough character with bad manners and worse taste, socially unacceptable and intellectually barren. Jones has a *feeling* of distaste when he thinks of Smith, and avoids him conscientiously. It happens that Jones, alone on an unguided world tour, has a transportation breakdown in a primitive village in a backward country. The villagers are unfriendly, unlettered and unsanitary. Into this unhappy and improbable scene, after a couple of days, rides Smith. Jones may well greet him with a joyful embrace, rather than with distaste. His image of Smith as a boor may be replaced by the image of a man who at least has the good sense to speak English and to wash his hands before eating. Whether or not this feeling and image will carry over in any way when the two men return to their home town is another matter — but the fact remains that a different external situation has evoked a different attitude.

Sherif and Cantril have called this situational factor "frame of reference." They write:

"The term 'frame of reference' is simply used to denote the functionally related factors (present and past) which operate at the moment to determine the particular properties of a psychological phenomenon (such as perception, judgment, affectivity)."[3]

In psychological literature, the critical importance of the situational factor is supported by experiments on many levels. Wever and Zener had subjects judge the weight of a series of objects as "light" or "heavy." When the series of objects was changed from a light series to a heavy series,

the same object that was formerly judged heavy was now perceived as light.[4] McGarvey had her subjects rate the "social prestige" of various occupations and found that the desirability of any given occupation was dependent on the kind of occupational series with which it appeared.[5]

Many research roads lead to the understanding that prejudiced attitudes can be highly situational in character. One evening at a summer camp, 30 young men were tested as to their attitudes towards Japanese-Americans. Following this, they were scheduled to attend a show at a local theatre. Instead, their show-going was cancelled, and they were forced to accomplish a series of complicated tasks. The same night, following the tasks, their attitudes towards Japanese-Americans were retested, and were found to be less favorable than they had been earlier in the evening. Nothing had changed in the interim with respect to the young men vis-à-vis Japanese-Americans, but some other factors in the situation had changed.[6]

Deitrich Reitzes examined a situation in which a group of white people had favorable attitudes towards Negroes at work and in shopping centers, but had unfavorable attitudes towards them living in their residential neighborhood.[7] He traced these inconsistencies to different attitudinal "fields"; that is, each of these situations had different external forces operating to form the interaction of attitude. The unions to which the white people belonged were actively committed to intergroup equality at work. The Chamber of Commerce and business groups in the area involved were actively seeking Negro trade. The neighborhood civic club, however, was actively exclusionist. There were different "collective interests" involved in the different situations. In short, an individual does not typically have "an attitude" towards Negroes; he has many different attitudes depending on the circumstances.

There are a number of different ways in which this "situational" character of prejudice may be described:

- A general attitude, about Negroes, for example, does not predetermine specific attitudes about Negroes. In other words, if a person has a general stereotype of Negroes, and a general hostility towards Negroes, this does not automatically mean that he will have an unfavorable attitude towards working in the same factory with Negroes.
- One specific attitude towards Negroes, e.g., working with them, may have a quite different texture from another specific attitude, e.g., living next to them.

• The same person may have one attitude about working next to Negroes in one situation, and a different attitude about working next to them in another situation.

• In sum, a prejudiced attitude may shift from one moment and situation to another.

Disparity Between the Attitude and the Act

The situational nature of prejudice is evident, too, in the mass of evidence concerning the disparity between *expressed* attitudes and behavior.

A Chinese couple traveled twice across the United States, and up and down the Pacific Coast. During the course of this trip, they asked for service in hundreds of hotels, auto camps, tourist homes and restaurants. They were refused accommodations in only one sleeping place, and in none of the eating places. Six months after their trip, R. T. LaPiere sent a mail questionnaire to each of these places asking if Chinese could be accommodated. Over 90 per cent of the 47 sleeping places and of the 81 eating places that replied said that Chinese would *not* be accommodated.[8]

In a northeastern suburban community, three young women, two white and one Negro, entered 11 restaurants. They encountered no problems, and received nothing less than exemplary service. Two weeks later a letter was sent to the same restaurants asking for reservations for a similar group. There was no answer to the letters, and great resistance to the follow-up phone calls.[9]

Saenger and Gilbert studied customer reactions to the employment of Negro sales personnel in New York City department stores. One group they interrogated had been observed as customers in stores where there were both Negro and white clerks. Twenty per cent of those who had bought from Negro clerks said they would disapprove of the policy of employing Negro clerks in the department stores; 21 per cent of those who had bought from white clerks expressed the same attitude. In other words, prejudice towards Negro clerks did not cause customers to avoid them in the stores. Over 40 per cent of those who said they would not buy in a store with Negro clerks had actually been observed not only in such a store but at a counter where there was a Negro clerk. One third of those who said they would never buy from a Negro clerk had been observed buying from a Negro clerk less than an hour before they were interviewed.[10]

17

The Behavior — Not the Attitude

It is true, of course, that the *expression* of an attitude may be different from or at least only a surface part of an attitude. A person who is asked whether he would have any objection to rooming with someone of another racial extraction may honestly say, and honestly believe, that he is free of such prejudiced attitudes. But he may find, to his own shock, that when it comes down to it he does have internal resistance to such a relationship; or indeed, without realizing it himself, he may find reasons and devices for avoiding such a relationship. Likewise, he may say that he *does* have objections, and when it comes down to it, he may not have these objections, or may not find them operative. His initial response may depend on the circumstances: who asks him and where. His ultimate reaction may also depend on the circumstances. This disparity between attitude as expressed and as it ultimately affects behavior merely re-emphasizes the *situational* character of the whole complex of prejudice. And it is the act of prejudice, not the attitude itself, which is the social problem of prejudice as earlier defined.

Andrew Kapos surveyed the attitudes of 30 segregated white gentile fraternities at the University of Michigan in 1953.[11] He found a more intensive feeling of general prejudice against Jews than against Negroes. But he also found more willingness to admit Jews than Negroes to the fraternities, possibly because of the group standards which the fraternity members felt existed in the world around them. The attitudes of almost a thousand Texas manufacturers towards Negroes were tested; and the results were compared with the actual hiring practices of these manufacturers.[12] It was found that the general attitude of a man towards Negroes had little to do with whether or not he employed them. An employer's willingness to hire Negroes was not significantly related to the degree of general hostility he felt or expressed towards Negroes.

In Panama there are places where one side of a street falls in the American Canal Zone, and the other side of the same street falls in Panamanian territory. Biesanz and Smith found that Panamanian Negroes tend to conform to discriminatory practices when they go to the Zone side of the street; while white Americans tend to adjust to non-discriminatory practices when they go to the Panamanian side.[13]

Whether in the fraternities of Ann Arbor, the factories of Texas or the streets of Panama, it is not the prejudiced attitude which is itself important to the social problem of prejudice. It is the act of excluding Negroes from the fraternities and from the factories that makes prejudice a problem for society. The attitudes are important to that problem only insofar as they *cause* these acts. It is clear, however, that a prejudiced attitude is not a kind of push-button, nor a constant psychic bundle; it is, more accurately, an interaction in any given situation. It is clear that general attitudes of prejudice do not necessarily predetermine prejudiced behavior; it is clear that a specific attitude at one moment does not predetermine the act that will eventuate at another moment. What, then, *is* the relationship between attitudes and behavior?

CHAPTER III

LEARNING PREJUDICE

Prejudiced behavior typically shapes and alters prejudiced attitudes. The learning of prejudice is effected primarily by the kinds of social situations in which people live.

The fact that attitudes do not necessarily predetermine behavior does not mean that attitudes and behavior do not typically accompany each other. The human being is not a mechanical jack-in-the-box. We do normally have feelings and conceptions that accompany our behavior. But our feelings and conceptions — our attitudes — do not necessarily *precede* our behavior. The attitude of the boy who is going to jump out of the box in the school play may be altered by the very fact that he is going to jump out of the box, just as his attitude immediately after his act may be shaped by the bare fact that he did jump out.

In brief, behavior typically shapes and alters attitudes. Cantril examined attitude polls on the subject of "lend-lease" assistance to the Allies before the United States was involved in World War II. He found that immediately after Congress actually passed lend-lease legislation, attitudes toward such legislation became more favorable by about ten per cent. The point according to Cantril is that public opinion tends to follow accomplished fact.[14]

Stouffer and his associates asked white soldiers: How would you like it if your division had companies which included both Negro and white platoons? Seven per cent of those who already were in a company with Negro platoons replied that they disliked the situation; 20 per cent of those questioned who were in the same regiment but not in the same company as Negro platoons replied that they would dislike it; 24 per cent of those who were in the same division but not the same regiment as Negro platoons replied that they would dislike it; 62 per cent of those questioned who were not even in the same division as Negro platoons replied that they would dislike it. The further they were from the accomplished fact, the more they disliked it.[15]

Deutsch and Collins surveyed attitudes of white residents in four different public housing projects in New York.

In two, Negro and white families were assigned indiscriminately to the same apartment buildings. In the other two, Negroes were assigned to different buildings within the same project.[16]

In all cases, the assignments were made under an automatic procedure that did not take into account the preference of those assigned. Asked if they would dislike living in the same buildings with Negroes, about three-quarters of the white respondents in the segregated projects said they would, as against only about one-quarter of those already living in the fully integrated units. About 50 per cent of those in the integrated projects said they desired to be friendly with their Negro neighbors, as against only about 10 per cent in the segregated projects. General attitudes towards Negroes seemed to be affected as well: about 75 per cent of those in the integrated units said they respected Negroes in general, as against well below 50 per cent of those in the segregated projects.

Attitudes After the Fact

Many research studies show that specific attitudes change after the fact, e.g.: attitudes towards living in the same neighborhood, serving in the same Army company. These studies are evidence that specific attitudes do shape themselves to specific behavior. However these studies do *not* indicate that a shift in one specific attitude towards a minority group will necessarily affect other specific attitudes towards the same group; or that a shift in a specific attitude will always affect the expression of a general attitude as it apparently did in the Deutsch and Collins study.

Harding and Hogrefe studied the attitudes of white employees towards Negro co-workers in department stores. The white employees were divided into three groups according to the nature and extent of their contact with Negroes. Group I included those who had worked in departments where there had been at least one Negro whose job was on an equal or superior plane. Group II included those who had worked in departments where Negroes had been of lower working status than themselves. Those in Group III had never worked in a department with Negroes.[17]

They were all asked: "How would you feel about taking a new job in which there were both Negroes and white people doing the same kind of work as you?" Seventy-three per cent of Group I, 61 per cent of Group II, and 48 per cent

of Group III said they would be favorable. But there was no significant difference between the three groups when they were asked, for example, whether they would want to sit next to Negroes on the bus or train. The experience of working with Negroes apparently only produced a more favorable attitude towards Negroes in that specific "fellow-employee" frame of reference.

A further clue may be found in the study of Daniel Wilner and his associates of attitudes of white residents in public housing projects.[18] This three-year study compared two kinds of white tenants: those who lived close to Negroes and those who lived at a relative distance. As in the Deutsch-Collins study, it was discovered that attitudes changed favorably as the distance to the Negroes decreased. Not only was there a significant difference in the specific attitude (i.e., living near Negroes), but again an apparent shift in general attitudes. In one project, for example, where Negroes and whites lived in the same buildings, 53 per cent of the respondents said that they generally liked and respected Negroes; in another project where the buildings were all-white and all-Negro only 36 per cent of the respondents said that they generally liked and respected Negroes.

However, the Wilner study went further. Among one group of women who lived close to Negroes, 32 per cent who had no personal contact with their Negro neighbors beyond casual greetings, had a high degree of general esteem for Negroes; 45 per cent who, in addition, had extended street conversation with their Negro neighbors had a high degree of general esteem for Negroes; and 74 per cent who had neighborly associations with Negroes, i.e., behaved like neighbors, had a high degree of esteem generally for Negroes.

Proximity was not a matter of choice but of automatic assignment. The greater the proximity, the more likely was there to be neighbor-like activity. A point made by the Wilner study is that the shift in general attitudes came not so much from mere contact or proximity, but from a changed pattern of behavior. The white residents who *acted* like neighbors came most often to *feel* like neighbors on many levels.

I. N. Brophy found a very marked reduction in general anti-Negro prejudice among white merchant seamen who, without the benefit of choice, had worked with Negro sailors. Thirty-three per cent of those who had never

shipped with Negroes were rated as unprejudiced; 46 per cent of those who had shipped with Negroes once; 62 per cent who had shipped with Negroes twice; and 82 per cent of those who had shipped with Negroes five or more times were rated as unprejudiced.[19] This was in sharp contrast to the Harding and Hogrefe study of the limited shifts in general attitudes for whites who had worked with Negroes in department stores. But these seamen not only worked together very closely, but also lived together 24 hours a day. And neighborly relationships are, of course, more general and encompassing than working relationships.

Behavior Shapes Attitude

In other words, evidence indicates that specific attitudes shape themselves to behavior. People who actually work with Negroes, especially as equals, develop attitudes favorable towards working with Negroes. People who actually are neighbors of Negroes develop attitudes favorable towards being neighbors of Negroes. Evidence also indicates that general attitudes shape themselves to behavior only if that behavior is itself general in nature. People who behave towards Negroes as full equals on every level tend to develop attitudes toward them as full equals on every level.

Thus, the mass of modern evidence runs counter to the "attitudes-first" fallacy, which holds that prejudice is a lurking state of mind that spills over into overt behavior. It might be more accurate to say that the prejudiced state of mind is typically a function of behavior; except for the danger that *this* formula might be over-simplified into a kind of reverse fallacy. Actually, there emerges an understanding that the key to prejudice must be found *outside* the realm of attitude-behavior relationships. The evidence has demonstrated how both attitudes and behavior are affected by the social frame of reference in which they occur.

In an integrated housing situation, attitudes and behavior are different than in a segregated housing situation. In an integrated army situation, attitudes and behavior are different than in a segregated army situation. In a shopping center situation attitudes and behavior towards Negroes are different than in a neighborhood situation. On one side of a Panamanian street, a white man's behavior towards Negroes may be different than on the other side of the street. It is this *situational* factor which is central to both attitude and behavior; which can stand outside any behavior-atti-

tude spiral and avoid the fruitless question: "Which comes first?"

The effect of the situational factor on the social problem of prejudice can be found in the dramatic story of post-war integration in the armed forces. A military installation comprises a kind of community in itself, with its own community practices and patterns. Soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen for the most part live as well as work within the military setting. Traditionally, the armed forces community had followed the racial patterns of the nation's lowest common denominator: the deep South. The assumption was made that only in this way could the armed forces accommodate the young men from the South as well as from other parts of the country who entered the services with deep-set attitudes of prejudice. Segregation was the rule on almost every level. Most military leaders expected it to stay that way indefinitely. In 1948, however, an edict was handed down by administrative order from President Truman's office: the armed forces were to be thoroughly and effectively integrated.

In its own inimitable way, the armed forces implemented this edict by a series of direct military orders. Today, there is effective integration throughout all the branches of service. In 1953, only five years after the original edict, Lee Nichols was able to report that Negroes and whites from all parts of the country were not just training and fighting together, but were also eating at the same tables, sleeping in the same quarters, drinking beer together, going to church and the movies together.[20]

Beyond the Call of Duty

A typical illustration of the process has been provided by Brigadier General Frank McConnell who had been assigned to command a major training base in South Carolina shortly after the integration edict. Customarily, as the recruits poured in, the Negroes were separated from the whites and established in separate organizations. General McConnell issued an order that the next 55 draftees who arrived would comprise a platoon, regardless of their color, and that this procedure would be followed with all subsequent arrivals. The order was issued verbally and "That," he said "was the end of segregation in Fort Jackson." There were no interracial incidents then or thereafter.

"I would see recruits, Negro and white, walking down

the street, all buddying together," said the General. "The attitude of the Southern soldiers was that this was the Army way; they accepted it the same way they accepted getting booted out of bed at 5:30 in the morning."

This was the Army way. This was the new social situation, the new set of practices which surrounded the white soldier who had been accustomed to quite another way of life. His new community accepted it, he accepted it. There were no incidents of any consequence. Scattered grumbling that was heard when the policy was announced, but before it was implemented, disappeared when integration actually took place. Apprehension had been unwarranted. A Congressional committee reported that "the almost total absence of opposition that had been anticipated in the enlisted men is a contributing factor in the success of this policy. The men were more ready for equality of treatment than the officer corps had realized." Commanders reported that interracial incidents had *lessened* under the policy of integration, as a result of the lessening of tensions.

The servicemen did not necessarily retain these specific attitudes or behavior patterns when they returned to their home towns. The situational factors had shifted back again. In many cases, their *general* attitudes may have altered somewhat, at least temporarily, because of their total-living experiences in integration; and the aspiration levels of the Negro servicemen may also have been raised as a result. But they settled back without difficulty in the segregated patterns of their home communities. More definitively, the practices of the armed forces had a direct impact on certain practices in the non-military community. Negro and white soldiers sat side by side on a city bus in Columbia, South Carolina, where such mingling was actually prohibited by law. Restaurants near military posts decided to admit Negroes along with white soldiers, partly because white and Negro soldiers began to accompany each other in town. In Amarillo, Texas, the USO club was opened to Negro airmen for the first time. Amarillo University began to admit Negroes to its extension classes. George L. P. Weaver, formerly of the CIO, told Lee Nichols that the elimination of segregation in the armed forces opened new job opportunities for Negroes with government contractors; indeed in the integrated military, Negro servicemen were often able to learn vocational skills which they otherwise could have had no opportunity to learn.

At the very least, within the relatively uncomplicated

society bounded by the armed forces, the *social problem* of prejudice had been virtually eliminated by the outlawing of prejudiced practices. Equality of opportunity is in effect. The aspirations of the non-whites within the military setting are being met. Interracial "incidents" and tensions have been reduced. This is not really being enforced at bayonet point, but has come to be accepted by servicemen. In terms of attitudes, they have, by and large, responded "beyond the call of duty" in their fraternization with fellow-servicemen of another race. Not only has behavior changed, which is the crux of the social problem, but behavior has patently shaped attitudes.

The Situation or The Personality

Perhaps then the most effective and workable approach to understanding the phenomenon of prejudice is through an investigation of the kinds of *social situations* which give rise to and sustain prejudiced behavior and attitudes. This is a sharply different approach from that which would investigate what kinds of *people* are prone to prejudice.

This is not to underestimate the special validity of an approach to prejudice from the vantage point of personality and personality differences. There are good reasons for making such a psychological approach. Prejudice serves an emotional function for many people. It helps them to shift blame from themselves to others, to rationalize their aggressions, or otherwise provides an outlet for their special emotional needs. Some people with special emotional needs have a special susceptibility to prejudice. In attempting to understand or remedy the particular virulence or persistence of a given individual's prejudice, it is often necessary to understand his psychological history.

One white factory worker got along very well with his co-worker who happened to be Negro. They were friendly, ate their lunches together, worked together harmoniously. Suddenly the white worker began to have severe marital troubles and seemed headed towards a divorce. He began to make slurring references to the Negro's race and they finally had to be separated. Another man, bitter because he was making no progress in his business firm, blamed the "Jews" in top management and became vocally anti-Semitic, although it turned out that there weren't any Jews in the management of the firm. One study of veterans found that those who were generally frustrated and felt that they had

been subject to "bad breaks" in the service were more often prejudiced than those who felt they had experienced "good breaks" in the service. There is evidence that many of those who stigmatize the Negro as hyper-sexual are indeed guilt-ridden by their own sexuality, and are attempting to rid themselves of that guilt by projecting it onto the Negro.

The body of psychological knowledge which throws light on these reactions is extremely helpful in explaining individual differences and in helping to treat individual problems. Since certain emotional needs are universal in one degree or another, this knowledge even helps to explain the special "attractiveness" that prejudice seems to have for human beings in general.

But it does not explain the specific *social problem* of prejudice with which our society is currently burdened. Presumably the factory worker who was having trouble with his wife would have found *some* scapegoat, even if there were no Negro available. It might have been the thinnest man in the factory, or the fattest, or the one with red hair, or perhaps just the one with whom he was most incompatible. The need to blame other people instead of oneself, to work out irrelevantly on other people one's guilt or aggressiveness or fear is an unhealthy condition in itself. It is a problem in mental health. Those who have this problem are undoubtedly more susceptible to prejudice and to other social aberrations than those who do not have such a problem. But this condition itself does not create the specific social evils attending prejudice as described earlier. It is only when these problems are displaced on groups and help establish a deep-going pattern of denying equal opportunity to specific groups that the social problem of prejudice emerges. In short, the factory worker's psychological reaction does not create the social problem of prejudice; it merely operates within the social framework of a pattern of prejudice which already exists.

Furthermore, the psychological approach, as valuable as it is, does not explain the preponderance of people who engage in prejudiced behavior, but do *not* have special emotional problems. It does not explain the widespread pattern of prejudice. It does not explain why prejudice is more intense in one place and time than in another.

The Lessons of Social Situations

These aspects of the social problem of prejudice are explainable only in terms of our *learning* prejudice much

as we learn our other basic patterns of social behavior. But people do not typically learn their social values and social behavior in the same way that they learn the arithmetic table. It is not a matter of formal training or mere intellectual acceptance. A child may "learn" the social precept that it is wrong to steal, but may steal nonetheless. He has effectively learned the social value of honesty only to the extent that he has "internalized" that value, i.e., to the extent that this social value has become a natural and unthinking part of his behavior. It is not that he weighs consequences, but that it would "go against his grain" to steal.

This is not the kind of learning which basically is effected in the classroom, or even at the mother's knee. It is shaped fundamentally not by lecture or exhortation, but, in a kind of "creeping socialization," by the kinds of social situations in which people live, and, especially, in which they grow up.

It then becomes necessary to define more precisely the nature of "social situation" as it applies to prejudice; and to discover the kinds of social situations which give rise to and sustain prejudice.

CHAPTER IV

THE PREJUDICED COMMUNITY

The pattern of community practices *is the fountainhead of prejudice: of prejudiced behavior and of prejudiced attitudes.*

The growing child learns his social behavior primarily by following the modes and models of behavior around him. Indeed, he has little choice. He learns how to behave towards people of other racial and religious groups by seeing how other people behave, and by automatically participating in the behavior patterns which already exist.

Consider the extreme but not atypical case of a community where the Negro population has been traditionally subordinate on every level. The Negro with whom the young child comes in contact is a domestic in his home, or an elevator operator or janitor or a worker in some other menial capacity. The Negroes he knows are not as well educated as the white people he knows, nor as well dressed, nor as well housed. The white people in his community do not socialize with Negroes, nor share the same public accommodations with them. No Negroes sit down at the same dinner table with him or with the people he knows; Negroes are not customers in the restaurants or hotels to which he is taken. Negroes are addressed by their first names, but always address the white people as "Mr." or "Mrs." They do not go to the same school as white children. They sit in separate sections of the bus. They use different rest rooms in the bus stations. If there is a tight fit on the sidewalk, it is the Negro pedestrian who gives way.

These are the social situations, i.e., the overt sets of relationships with which the child is surrounded. He does not have to be *told* that Negroes are "inferior," or what his relationships to them are supposed to be. These are apparent. Even more important, he is part of the white community and necessarily he *behaves* within the framework of these existing relationships. It is not just that his parents use a different rest room than do the Negroes. *He* uses a different rest room than the Negroes. *He* sits in the white section of the bus. *He* behaves towards them as social inferiors, and naturally comes to accept them as social inferiors. It isn't necessary to inculcate in him explicit atti-

tudes about the social inferiority of Negroes. More likely, it is necessary for him to develop attitudes that do not conflict with his behavior.

Negroes conform to the prevailing patterns in such a community not only because they must, but also in part because they have accepted the values of the dominant community, and for the same reasons. They have been part of the same behavior patterns.

This process takes place at an early age. In one nursery school study, when pre-school Negro children were given a white and Negro doll to play with, they almost uniformly preferred the white doll.[21]

Schools for Prejudice

There is a tendency to believe that these kinds of prejudicial behavior patterns are to be found preponderantly in the deep South. It is often startling to those in the northern and western parts of the country to find, by the most casual self-survey, the extent to which their own communities are "schools for prejudice" by dint of similar ongoing situations.

In the North and West, Negroes and whites typically live in different neighborhoods. That these Negro neighborhoods are usually inferior to the white is a fact readily apparent to the young observer. The proportion of substandard housing occupied by Negroes in 1952, according to U. S. Census standards, was six times as great as that occupied by whites. This was a uniform condition around the country. Nor is residential separatism restricted to the racial level. The Anti-Defamation League found, in a 1959 survey, that housing segregation on a religious basis was becoming more prevalent than was thought to be the case. For example, it found that a number of residential communities in the Chicago area were almost completely closed to Jews, and others had "large areas where Jews are barred."

Negroes typically work in lower-status jobs in communities throughout the nation. An index of this comparative status is the fact that the average earnings of the Negro worker is little more than half that of the white worker. This is partly the result of the history of educational and economic disadvantage which is the heritage of the Negro. But it is to a large extent the result of current prejudice. Where surveys have been made of job orders by employers in the North and West, in communities as

widely separated as Los Angeles and Chicago, it has been found that at least 75 per cent of the job orders for white collar workers specify "white only." At least 25 per cent of these job orders specify "Christian only." (In 1959, the State of California took steps to remedy this situation with the passage of a Fair Employment Practices Act.)

It has been estimated that about one-quarter of the Negro school children *outside* the South go to schools that are in fact substantially all-Negro, and about half go to schools where there is only token mixing. This is largely a result of segregated housing patterns.

John P. Dean supervised a study of 248 cities, ranging in population from 10 thousand to 500 thousand, to determine the extent to which American Jews were thoroughly integrated. Three tests were used: admission to Junior League; admission to country clubs and city clubs; admission to exclusive residential areas. In one-third of the cities, Jews are denied admission to all three. In only 20 out of the 248 cities are some Jews accepted in all three, and these 20 are smaller cities. In more than half of the 50 largest cities in the study, Jews are denied admission to all three categories; and in only one are they admitted to all three.[22]

These behavior patterns are not only the substance of prejudice as a social problem; they are also the breeding conditions of prejudice. In a very real sense, prejudiced behavior reproduces itself, carries within it its own seeds of continuity. In the same sense, prejudice is a dramatic example of the "self-fulfilling prophecy." The prejudiced image of a Negro as a constitutionally menial worker is sustained by the prejudiced behavior which in fact freezes him as a menial worker.

The Projection of Prejudice

The learning of prejudice is a natural result of actual participation in patterns of prejudiced behavior; or of first-hand observation of the patterns of prejudiced behavior in the community; but it may also result from *vicarious* participation, or *second-hand* observation of the patterns of prejudiced behavior. A society provides many "cues" for social behavior, e.g.: "white" and "colored" signs above public drinking fountains; or classified ads in the newspapers which read "gentile only"; or house-for-sale signs which read "white only" or "restricted."

During the war, 200 short stories were analyzed for

their treatment of minority group characters. The Anglo-Saxon characters were usually shown as members of the more desirable occupations: bankers, businessmen and teachers. The ethnic minorities pursued lower-class occupations as peddlers, small businessmen or workers. The Negro characters were typically poorly educated, and even comic. More than that, the ethnic minorities were cast in those marginal and even illicit occupations which are found in disproportion among the socially dispossessed. When there were characters who were "menials"--racketeers, thieves, gamblers, shady night club operators, crooked prize fight managers--such non-sympathetic characters were seldom Anglo-Saxon."[23]

In some cases, these characterizations merely picture the prevailing conditions as they actually exist, e.g., the preponderant number of Negroes in menial positions, and thereby support the inference that these are the only kinds of positions for which Negroes are suited. The mass media, as the above analysis indicates, often accentuate and even exaggerate these conditions by failing to project representative counter-images, e.g., Negroes who are well-educated and serving in high capacities in society.

These signs and images projected by the community are visible extensions of the basic behavior patterns of the community. They are part of the complex of social situations in which a young child finds himself. When a child sees a series of signs in front of houses saying "Gentile only," it is not so much that these signs *tell* him that Jews are socially unacceptable, but that these signs convey to him the way in which his elders behave, and the way in which *he* is expected to behave. These cues and vicarious experiences serve a supporting role for those who are directly participant in prejudiced behavior patterns towards minority groups; but they also provide "training" for those who have had less opportunity to participate directly in such behavior.

It was found that 110 businessmen and school teachers on the West Coast had about the same prejudice ranking as 239 Middle West college students. Hartley discovered that the girls in Bennington College in Vermont had the same attitudes towards most minority groups as did Negro students at Howard University in Washington, D. C., and concluded that "this pattern of prejudice is practically an American institution."[24]

A standard clue to this phenomenon of universality can

be found in the mass media survey earlier quoted. In the magazine stories studied, only 2 per cent of the Anglo-Saxon characters were in illegal and suspect occupations, as against 15 per cent of the ethnic minority characters. In an analysis of 100 motion pictures involving Negro characters it was found that only in 12 instances was the Negro presented favorably. This is vicarious experience for those who do not otherwise have contact with Negroes; experience with the Negro as he is projected by these films; and experience with the way in which other people in the nation behave and are supposed to behave towards Negroes.[25]

Social Involvement Reproduces Prejudice

In other words, the basic element in the learning of prejudice is involvement in social situations, i.e., behavior patterns which are themselves prejudiced in nature. Such social situations may be prejudicial:

1—Where the individual's own behavior is prejudiced as part and parcel of the community's prejudiced pattern of life, e.g., segregated schools, buses, waiting rooms, complete social segregation, habits of deference.

2—Where the models of behavior around the child behave in a prejudiced fashion. This may consist of the direct perception of the community's prejudiced pattern of life. It may consist of the direct perception of the symbolic *evidences* of the community's prejudiced pattern of life, as in signs and advertisements. It may consist of an indirect perception of such a pattern through the mass media.

3—Where the unfavorable images of minority groups projected by the social pattern lend themselves to prejudicial behavior. Both the educational and employment status of the Negro, for example, have been artificially depressed. Especially where his contact with minority group members is limited, the child finds it only natural to behave towards Negroes as though they were constitutionally ignorant and fitted only for menial positions in life. Then, there are the concomitants of low economic and educational status, and of the lower stake which an oppressed minority group may feel that it has in society--a proportionately high level of superstition, for example, or of ostentation, or of crime. These evidences, too, the child will accept as part of the normal state of things, everything else being equal.

In these several ways, then, it is on the level of actual behavior situations that the normal reproduction of preju-

dice is effected. It is within the framework of these behavior situations that individual differences, except perhaps the most pathological, operate. It is on the base of these behavior situations that the behavior-attitude spiral of prejudice builds. Attitudes and explicit ideologies are most firmly constructed on the foundation of these existing social situations.

Indeed, the attitudes which must develop to accompany human behavior are *implied* in this behavior, and it is in this way that such attitudes are primarily learned rather than by direct instruction. By the time a child is told for the first time that "Negroes are inferior," he is already convinced of it. On the other hand, by the time he is told for the first time that "Negroes are *not* inferior" it is already often too late. He will resist the idea. Or, if he is finally intellectually convinced of the fact that Negroes are not inferior, he may evade the consequences. He may find some other reason for behaving towards the Negroes *as though* they were inferior. It is axiomatic in all learning situations that rhetorical exhortations have little chance of success when they are in battle against actual behavior patterns. For example, a child will not tend to be honest because his father tells him to be, if the same father is constantly engaged in dishonest practices himself.

Studies of the development of prejudice in children show that young children who have not yet been involved in prejudiced behavior patterns, may pick up prejudiced talk, but this doesn't affect their unprejudiced behavior. Later, after having become involved in prejudiced behavior patterns, they may pick up democratic language in the schools or elsewhere, but this doesn't affect their prejudiced behavior. By the age of 15, Gordon Allport points out, "considerable skill is shown in imitating the adult pattern."[28]

They are now able to rationalize their prejudiced behavior whenever necessary and resort to the prejudiced ideologies which do not precede but follow prejudiced behavior patterns.

In brief, the pattern of *community practices* serves as the primary source of prejudice in behavior and attitude.

CHAPTER V

FAMILY AND GROUP INFLUENCES IN THE PREJUDICED COMMUNITY

The complex of prejudicial practices within a community provides the family and other traditional groups with the "frame of reference" which perpetuates these practices and sustains prejudice.

A community is not simply a collection of people. It is, for one thing, a collection of associations: families and other special groupings. It consists also of certain community institutions, such as schools, libraries and newspapers. It is characterized by laws and by common customs. It has an economic life, a residential pattern, and certain leisure-time habits and facilities. A community exists on many levels. Prejudiced and prejudicial community practices embrace practices on all these levels.

These practices are not necessarily uniform in nature. There may be less prejudice in employment than in housing. There may be some churches that are segregated and others that are not. There may be some groups that promote prejudice and others that oppose it. It is sensible, therefore, to talk about *prevailing* practices in a community. In generalizing about "community practices" the reference is necessarily to *prevailing* practices, with which certain specific group practices may conceivably be in conflict.

Influences on the Child

The child learns his prejudiced behavior and attitudes primarily from the modes and models of behavior around him; and the modes and models of behavior which are most influential on the child are normally those of the people or groups with whom he most closely identifies. The most potent influence on the very young child is likely to be at the family level. As a teen-ager, the most potent influence is often likely to come from his circle of peers.

One study of New York school children between the ages of 7 and 13 showed the extent to which the judgments of children are more likely to be influenced by the attitudes of their classmates than by the authority of their teachers. The investigator asked these children to estimate the length of lines and make certain comparisons between lines. Always

the largest group of children was instructed, unknown to the individual subject, to give answers that were sometimes obviously incorrect. The test found that an individual child, confronted with the fact that the majority of his own classmates were making an incorrect judgment, tended to modify his own judgment according to the opinions of the rest. On the other hand, when the teacher tried to influence the child's judgment by false opinions, not one of the children followed the teacher's judgment completely.[27]

However, family and group practices are not normally in conflict with prevailing practices in the community at large. Family and group life are typically part and parcel of community life. They are at the same time one of the products of the total community life, and one of the chief agents for perpetuating the character of community life.

Families and other traditional groups are the most effective instruments that a society has for directly transmitting its values and favored modes of behavior.

One college student reported his memory of his first day in prep school in this way: "One of the older boys remarked about a schoolmate, 'Don't you know that Harry is a Jew?' I had never met a Jew before and personally didn't care whether or not Harry—who seemed a likeable fellow—was a Jew, but the older boy's tone of voice was enough to convince me that I had better not make Harry my friend. Thereafter, I avoided Harry. And although I couldn't understand why we should dislike Jews, I gradually accepted the prejudice. It seemed strange that a feeling of antagonism toward Harry should grow up in me, but it did. Personally I had no unpleasant experience with him or with any other Jew I ever met."[28]

The group with which this boy identified, and with which he had some need to conform, gave him an explicit clue to its practices with regard to Jews. He did, in fact, conform with these practices and as a result *"gradually accepted the prejudice."*

Such specific group patterns provide a substantial proportion of the prejudiced behavior in the "prejudiced community." It is estimated that more than half of the college fraternities and sororities engage in such practices. The John P. Dean study indicated the extent to which social clubs in our communities engage in such practices.[29] Less than one-half of one per cent of the seven million Negro Protestants in this country worship regularly in non-segregated churches.

The Role of the Family

It is in the immediate family, of course, that the foundations for the young child's behavior patterns are most directly set. Here is built society's first wall of separation, when the family pointedly avoids contact with minority group members in the community. The family, of course, may take a direct hand in guiding the child into "proper" behavior practices towards minority group members. Eugene and Ruth Horowitz reported on the training methods used in two Tennessee communities.[30] They found that white parents will often punish the children in order to get them to stop playing with Negro children. These white children will often verbalize reasons for not playing with the Negro children. Frequently they offer such self-serving reasons as "because I'm white and he's black." But these aren't really the reasons why they stop playing together. They stop playing with Negroes because they will be punished if they don't stop.[31] It has already been reported that studies of the development of prejudice in children show that young children who have not yet been involved in prejudiced behavior patterns may pick up prejudiced talk without acting in a prejudiced manner. Similarly, young children who *have* been involved in prejudiced behavior patterns may pick up prejudiced talk, but this talk does not necessarily have any effective relation to their prejudiced behavior. Their genuine acceptance of prejudiced talk and prejudiced attitudes often comes later, in the wake of established behavior patterns. They may even forget that they were ever punished for playing with Negro children.

In addition, the child will typically pick up "cues" from the family circle which family members may never have meant to provide. Parents are often shocked to discover, if they ever do, the extent to which young children are "cue-sensitive."

Lasker told the story about the settlement worker who found a little boy crying bitterly. "She asked him what was the matter. 'Hit by a Polish boy,' the little man repeated several times. Inquiry among the bystanders showed that the offender was not Polish at all. Turning again to her little friend, she said, 'You mean, hit by a big naughty boy.' But he would not have it thus and went on repeating that he had been hit by a Polish boy. This struck the worker as so curious that she made inquiries of the little fellow's fam-

ily. She learned that he lived in the same house with a Polish family and that the Italian mother, by constantly quarreling with her Polish neighbor, had put into the heads of her children a notion that 'Polish' and 'bad' were synonymous terms."[31]

Cue-Sensitivity

It is this cue-sensitivity of children that explains the impact of the "harmless" little jokes that father tells featuring comic, lazy and superstitious Negroes; or the insinuating little references that mother makes about the Jewish women who have applied for admission to her club. For the child these cues are "second-hand" evidence of the behavior that he may expect of his parents, and of the behavior which is expected of him towards minority group members.

Of course, such cues require an appropriate context of family behavior; even if it is the negative one of systematically avoiding contact with minority group members. Indeed, if father's behavior towards Negroes is in striking contrast to his stereotype-stories about Negroes, these stories lose much of their significance as cues. This relationship between language and behavior is common to all human experience. We are likely to accept being made the butt of a joking remark by someone we know is friendly to us; we are more likely to be offended if the same remark is made by someone we know is unfriendly to us, or by someone of whom we are uncertain. Words often take on their meaning only within the context of behavior.

It is apparent that the family is uniquely in the position of being able to move *against* the community mainstream in shaping the initial behavior and attitudes of young children. If a family is ideologically and bitterly prejudiced, it can explicitly generate a prejudice that outstrips the general community temper. Gordon Allport reports this testimony from two people who were especially indoctrinated:[32]

"When I was about six my great-grandfather was in our home. He was especially rabid against Southerners and against Irish-Catholics. After hearing him condemn both these groups repeatedly I became convinced they must be obnoxious indeed."

"My prejudice against Jews arose through my parents' attitude towards Jews. In my father's business he had encountered certain Jews with whom his transactions had

been unfortunate, and he was and still is very bitter on the subject."

Conversely, a family which sets itself sharply and pointedly against the prejudiced patterns of the community can generate a special resistance to prejudice in young children.

Deviant family environments, like deviant personalities, can sometimes explain a special propensity for or resistance to prejudice. But the family is not normally an alien island within the body of the community. Where families punish children for playing with Negroes, they do so because of prevailing community practices. The slurring remarks or references family members make are not just whimsical or accidental, but flow naturally from the patterns of community life in which they participate. Where families avoid social contact with minority group members, they do so as part of the community design. It is common for residents of suburban areas to comment in all innocence: "We have no racial problem here. No Negroes happen to live in our tract." But it is not happenstance that no Negroes live in many of the suburban tracts within metropolitan areas that have large Negro populations. And their absence, as part of a design of segregation, does directly nourish the problem of prejudice.

The Family Follows the Community

In other words, family and group practices are typically consistent with prevailing community practices. These community practices provide the "frame of reference," the social *situations* which are the key to the genesis and sustenance of prejudice. Such practices can be prejudicial by:

1—Prescribing the modes of behavior by which the individual himself will behave towards minority group members in various settings; i.e., as employees, as fellow-workers, as neighbors, as social acquaintances, as friends.

2—Providing direct or indirect evidence of the modes of behavior which the rest of the community applies to minority group members in these various settings.

In addition, the unfavorable images of minority groups projected by the community pattern, which support these practices, are themselves perpetuated by these practices.

This network of prejudicial situations in a community typically generates prejudice in a child without formal or explicit training. Lillian Smith wrote:

"I do not remember how or when but by the time I had learned that God is love, that Jesus is his Son, and came to give us a more abundant life, that all men are brothers with a common Father, I also knew that I was better than a Negro, that all black folks have their place and must be kept in it, that sex has its place and must be kept in it, that a terrifying disaster would befall the South if I ever treated a Negro as my social equal."

Most people would have difficulty remembering the "how or when" of their prejudice, because in most cases there was no single impact and no single time, but rather the gradual, normal and inexorable press of the Prejudiced Community.

CHAPTER VI

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

The custom *of prejudice, once examined and understood, may be changed through remedial social action. Various channels of social action such as:* The Law, Direct Action, Mass Media, The Schools, *and* Community Groups *may help to effect this change. In addition, the individual must examine and attempt to understand his own behavior and attitude.*

It is the pattern of prejudiced practices in the community which typically gives rise to and sustains prejudiced behavior and attitudes. This does not mean that we are merely back on the causative merry-go-round, where behavior chases attitude and attitude chases behavior in a dismally unending circle. "Community practices" connotes more than just the sum total of individual behavior at any given time. It means customary collective behavior. It means collective habits which tend to perpetuate themselves with their own momentum, such as the collective habit of smoking tobacco or drinking coffee.

Similarly, prejudiced community practices typically reproduce themselves by force of *custom*. All other things being equal, these practices are passed automatically from one generation to the next. John Dollard, after studying traditional patterns of prejudice in a southern town, wrote:

"The master defense against accurate social perception . . . is always . . . the tremendous conviction of rightness about any behavior form which exists. What is done is de facto right and is justified by the consideration that it has not been invented by current culture bearers but comes to them through sacred tradition."[34]

The Persistence of Prejudice

The sheer power of custom recreates prejudiced community practices—which in turn, typically, breeds individual practices of prejudice, and, then, individual attitudes of prejudice. As a matter of fact, it is possible for prejudiced custom to persist without building up *any* corresponding attitudes.

For example, it has become commonplace for investiga-

tors of prejudiced employment practices to find the following kind of situation:

A personnel officer in a large firm tells a Jewish applicant, in effect, that he is sorry but the firm does not hire Jews as salesmen. A complaint is brought to the head of the firm, who expresses genuine astonishment. "What difference does it make?" he asks. "A good salesman is a good salesman." A visit is then made to the personnel officer who himself expresses genuine astonishment. No Jews had ever been hired by that firm, and he had just assumed that it was policy.

The department stores of a city with a fairly large Negro population had never hired a Negro clerk. As the store owners were approached on this situation, one by one, they indicated that they really had no objection to employing Negroes, and really hadn't given the matter much thought. It just "hasn't been done." One department store departed from the custom and hired Negro clerks; the others followed cheerfully and without incident.

These customary community practices, with or without corresponding attitudes, are the "frame of reference," the *situational* key to the prevention of and altering of the widespread phenomena of prejudiced behavior and prejudiced attitudes. This pattern of community practices is the basic remedial target, rather than emotional maladjustment, or any given set of prejudiced attitudes.

Channels of Social Action

Even though these customary community practices tend to perpetuate themselves automatically, they are not unalterable—and, indeed, man's past is a record of controversial shifts in custom. The slow, elephantine movement of history can shape and bend custom to its needs. The recent developments in race relations in this country provide a case in point, e.g., the manpower needs of booming industry, sharply accented by the two world wars of the half-century, began to break down segregated patterns in the factories of the North and the West.

But man is also capable of *deliberately* breaking or altering the chain of custom through varying channels of social action:

1) *Law*—The importance of law is not that it prohibits or eliminates prejudiced behavior and attitudes—but that it changes the social situations and community practices

which breed prejudiced behavior and attitudes. Since these situations and practices are the prime learning influences with respect to prejudice, law then must be perceived as a prime *educational* weapon in combatting prejudice.

New York City passed a law prohibiting the practice of segregation in public housing. As a result of this law, as the Deutsch and Collins study demonstrated, individual behavior and individual attitudes were altered.[35] A number of states now have such housing laws. Many more states and a number of cities have fair employment practices laws. Again, the chief effect of this law is to break the crust of custom with respect to hiring minority group members. In only a fraction of one per cent of the cases that have been handled by fair employment practices commissions has there been the necessity to bring a case to court. As a matter of fact, the essential impact of the law goes far beyond the actual cases that are handled. In one California city, the major taxicab company had traditionally refused to hire Negro drivers. One week after the passage of a fair employment law, and without any complaint having been lodged, the company began to hire Negro drivers. Within six months, it employed over 150 Negro drivers. Not only was a pattern of employment changed, but the "prejudiced face" of the community in general had been softened.

In addition, these laws hasten the elimination of prejudiced "cues" in the community; discriminatory signs and advertisements are prohibited and no longer remind the young and adult alike that prejudice is an accepted pattern in the community.

Changes in law include changes in interpretation of the law by administrative or judiciary decision, as well as the passage of new legislation. It was by administrative order that the federal government imposed fair employment practices on itself, and desegregated the armed forces. The landmark judicial decision of the era, of course, has been the Supreme Court ruling that officially segregated public schools are unconstitutional. Indeed, the Supreme Court, in making this legal pronouncement, invoked the findings of modern social science that racially separate schools—even if they are equal in facilities—are prejudicial in nature. The effect of this decision is to break down a set of community practices which automatically breed prejudiced behavior and attitudes. In the furor over the resistance of some hardcore Southern states to the Court decision, the extent to which a vast section of the South has *conformed* is often

overlooked. For millions of southern whites and Negroes, the Supreme Court ruling has effectively shattered a long-established custom of separation.

It is not "racial contact" alone that is effected by these laws. One unpublished study of interracial contact in 71 different instances revealed that contact lessened prejudice on 37 occasions but increased prejudice on 34 occasions. As the Wilner study on housing pointed up, it is not the proximity that counts, in shifting attitudes, but rather the kind of behavior that is possible under conditions of proximity. And, of course, friendly association is normally based on similarity of socio-economic and educational status. The reduction of prejudiced practices has improved the economic and educational status of the American Negro community. It has thereby created new social situations in which changed behavior towards and changed images of this minority group are shaped.

2) *Direct Action*—The law is perhaps the most far-reaching instrument for the change of custom. But community practices can be changed short of law. As in the case of the department store patterns cited above, a significant change in community practice can be engineered by direct negotiation between the "gate-keepers" of the prejudiced custom, and an interested citizens' group or agency. Service clubs have on occasion been persuaded to abandon prejudiced practices, and so have fraternities. "Pilot" housing projects have in several instances been set up under private auspices to *demonstrate* the feasibility of interracial housing, in an effort to actively break the mold of custom. In the deep South, where the custom of prejudice has permeated the local culture for many generations, direct action has become a prime weapon of the Negro community in breaking down white resistance to the national law. "Sit-ins" by Negro youths broke the custom of refusing lunch counter service to non-whites throughout a large part of the South. Non-violent demonstrations in Birmingham and elsewhere forced the business communities of deep southern cities to make plans for altering other customs of prejudice. The result: irreversible changes in community practices which eventually and inevitably lead to changes in community attitudes.

There have been many instances of sectarian religious practices, in one form or another, being promoted in the public schools of some of the nation's communities. Constitutional questions aside, these practices have often been

charged with placing the stigma of inferior status on members of minority religions in the community. This, too, could become part of a pattern of community practices generating prejudice, even though the practices themselves are certainly not motivated by prejudiced attitudes. Having gained this insight, many school authorities have themselves modified such sectarian practices.

3) *Mass Media*—There is also the possibility of directly changing some of the "second-hand" vicarious experiences and cues which support prejudiced practices, and which sometimes substitute for them with some effectiveness. The mass media portrayal of minority group characters is an example. The flagrant display of rental signs reading "restricted" is another example. They can help set the fashion or custom of prejudiced behavior. Such distorted portrayals and cue signs can be eliminated. But, more positively, the mass media can be used to project images and custom-cues that are counter to prejudice. Negroes can sometimes be portrayed as doctors, businessmen or writers, in which capacities an increasing number of them do serve. Authoritative figures can speak out against prejudiced behavior, in the name of democracy, morality and good sense. This is not a matter of directly altering prejudiced attitudes through any given mass media effort. Indeed, research evidence indicates overwhelmingly that prejudiced attitudes are resistant to any such *direct* assaults through the mass media. This is rather a matter of somewhat changing the face of the prejudiced community. Mass media efforts can be thought of most fruitfully in terms of their ability to change community customs and practices, rather than their ability to directly alter individual attitudes.

4) *The Schools*—School segregation, official or unofficial, is an obvious and significant part of the prejudiced community. In addition children "learn" social behavior in the school just as they do in the community at large, not, primarily, by lecture or exhortation, but by actually behaving in certain customary fashions. The school is at its most effective in democratic training where its program permits and stimulates children to behave democratically and flexibly towards each other. This program might extend from student self-government to the more intricate matter of handling classroom discussions, so that the fullest participation and mutual respect may develop among the students. The school is at its most effective in promoting good intergroup relations, where Negro and Caucasian children, for

example, participate equally in such a program. Of course, such participation is impossible where segregation exists either by law or in fact.

In one sense school practices are an integral part of the prevailing pattern of community practices and cannot radically transcend them. Statistical evaluations of school programs designed to reduce prejudice have uniformly revealed insignificant shifts, if any, in attitude. However, such statistical evaluations cannot gainsay the fact that school practices comprise a substantial part of the community practices to which children are exposed; and that, within certain limits, the schools are in the position of providing good, bad or indifferent learning situations for their students with respect to intergroup relations.

Nor is it possible, while emphasizing the prime importance of "good practices" in school programs, to dismiss the cumulative effect of academic knowledge as distinct from moral exhortation. Specifically, the scientific discrediting of theories of racial inferiority; more generally, the acquisition of greater perspective of human history, have inevitably weakened the structure of rationalization which it is possible to bring to prejudice. This does not in itself alter patterns of prejudiced behavior, but typically makes a transition in such patterns that much easier.

5) *Community Groups*—Every American community is replete with associations of citizens voluntarily banded together for a variety of purposes, e.g., business, labor, social, fraternal, religious, educational. The practices of these associations may have some effect on the membership of those associations, and may also have some effect on community practices at large.

An organization's membership policy automatically structures the intergroup behavior of its members; it creates, in effect, one of the social situations in which its members' social behavior is molded. The importance of this social situation in any given case varies with the importance of the association to its members. But as significant as this internal aspect is the impact that an organization's membership policy has on the community as a whole. A policy of membership exclusion is an open behavior-cue for the entire community. In July of 1951, a Negro bus driver and his family tried to move into a previously all-white neighborhood in a suburb of Chicago. A bloody three-day riot ensued. The community leaders of Chicago were shocked by the hoodlumism. But in the same month, one of the leading

social clubs of the city, to which many of these community leaders belonged, refused to allow one of the world's outstanding scientists into its luncheon room because he was Negro. This club, along with many others, had provided cues to behavior which had helped to breed the suburban violence. Indeed, the combined membership and admission policies of community groups are a key element in any Prejudiced Community.

Further, when an association puts itself *on public record* as opposed to discriminatory practices, or institutes an internal educational program, or participates actively in some community program in opposition to discriminatory practices, it is intensifying its impact on the behavior patterns of the community. The impact on community practices is often self-multiplying, as in the case of an organization which has become officially sensitive to the problem and refuses to hold its convention at a hotel which discriminates.

An Understanding of Behavior and Attitude

The purpose of this discussion has been to develop the concept of "The Prejudiced Community"—prevailing prejudiced and prejudicial community behavior customs. This is the self-renewing source of prevalent individual patterns of prejudiced behavior and attitude. This is the target of remedial social action; however it may tactically have to be reached.

In addition, the concept of "The Prejudiced Community" has implications for the individual as he attempts to understand and deal with his own individual behavior and attitudes. Certainly it is not necessary for any given person to be "trapped" by the custom of prejudice, since we all have the human will and human reason which are fully capable of breaking that trap. Once we understand the kind of hidden influences generated by the Prejudiced Community that have shaped our prejudiced behavior and attitudes, we can better understand that this behavior and these attitudes are not ordained or as hallowed as we might have unthinkingly believed. Only with this understanding is it possible for each man to stand aside from an attitude which he has always accepted and hold it up to the light of rational inquiry.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER 2

1. Gerhart Saenger and Samuel Flowerman, "Stereotypes and Prejudicial Attitudes," *Human Relations*, Volume 7, 1954, pages 217-238.

2. B. M. Kramer, "Residential Contact as a Determinant of Attitudes Toward Negroes," *unpublished Ph.D. thesis*, Harvard College Library, 1950.

3. M. Sherif and H. Cantril, *The Psychology of Ego-Involvements, Social Attitudes and Identifications*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1947, page 34.

4. E. G. Wever and K. E. Zener, "The Method of Absolute Judgment in Psychophysics," *Psychological Review*, 1928, Number 35, pages 466-493.

5. H. R. McGarvey, "Anchoring Effects in the Absolute Judgment of Verbal Materials," *Archives of Psychology*, 1943, Number 281.

6. N. E. Miller and R. Bugelski, "Minor Studies of Aggression: II, The Influence of Frustrations Imposed by the Ingroup on Attitudes Expressed Toward Outgroups," *Journal of Psychology*, Volume 25, 1948, pages 437-442.

7. Deitrich Reitzes, "The Role of Organizational Structure," *Journal of Social Issues*, Volume 9, 1953, pages 37-44.

8. Richard LaPiere, "Attitudes Versus Actions," *Social Forces*, Volume 13, 1934, pages 230-237.

9. Bernard Kutner, Caroll Wilkins and P. R. Yarrow, "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behavior Involving Racial Prejudice," *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, Volume 47, 1952, pages 649-652.

10. Gerhart Saenger and Emily Gilbert, "Customer Reactions to the Integration of Negro Sales-Personnel," *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, Spring 1950, page 74.

11. Andrew Kapos, "Some Individual and Group Determinants of Fraternity Attitudes Toward the Admission of Members of Certain Minority Groups," *Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Michigan, 1953.

12. H. A. Bullock, "Racial Attitudes and the Employment of Negroes," *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 56, 1950-51, pages 448-457.

13. John Biesanz and Luke M. Smith, "Race Relations of Panama and the Canal Zone," *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 47, 1951-52, pages 7-14.

CHAPTER 3

14. Hadley Cantril and Associates, *Gauging Public Opinion*, Princeton University Press, 1944, pages 226, 230.

15. Samuel A. Stouffer, et al, *The American Soldier*, Princeton University Press, Volume 2, 1949, pages 570 ff.

16. Morton Deutsch and Mary A. Collins, *Interracial Housing; A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1951.

17. John Harding and Russell Hogrefe, "Attitudes of White Department Store Employees Toward Negro Co-Workers," *Journal of Social Issues*, Volume 8, 1952, pages 18-28.

18. Daniel M. Wilner, Rosabelle T. Walkley and Stuart W. Cook, "Residential Proximity and Intergroup Relations In Public Housing Projects," *Journal of Social Issues*, Volume 8, 1952, pages 45-69.

19. Ira N. Brophy, "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 9, 1945-46, pages 456-466.

20. Lee Nichols, *Breakthrough on the Color Front*, Random House, 1954.

CHAPTER 4

21. Mary E. Goodman, *Race Awareness in Young Children*, Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, 1952 and revised edition, Collier, 1964.

22. John P. Dean, "Jewish Participation in American Community Life," *Cornell University Study*, presented at the Tercentenary Conference on American Jewish Sociology, New York City, 1954.

23. Writers War Board, *How Writers Perpetuate Stereotypes*, New York, 1945.

24. Eugene Hartley, *Problems in Prejudice*, Jamestown Press, 1946.

25. Writers War Board, op. cit.

26. Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, 1954, page 310 and revised edition, Doubleday, 1958.

CHAPTER 5

27. Ruth W. Berenda, *The Influence of the Group on the Judgments of Children*, King's Crown Press, 1950.

28. Gordon W. Allport, op. cit., page 287.

29. John P. Dean, op. cit.

30. E. Horowitz and R. Horowitz, "Development of Social Attitudes in Children," *Sociometry*, 1937, pages 301-338.

31. Bruno Lasker, *Race Attitudes in Children*, Henry Holt, New York, 1929, page 98.

32. Gordon W. Allport, op. cit., page 292.

33. Lillian Smith, *Killers of the Dream*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1949, page 18.

CHAPTER 6

34. John Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1937, pages 366-367.

35. Morton Deutsch and Mary A. Collins, op. cit.